



County of Los Angeles CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICE

Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration
500 West Temple Street, Room 713, Los Angeles, California 90012
(213) 974-1101
<http://ceo.lacounty.gov>

WILLIAM T FUJIOKA
Chief Executive Officer

July 20, 2012

To: Supervisor Zev Yaroslavsky, Chairman
Supervisor Gloria Molina
Supervisor Mark Ridley-Thomas
Supervisor Don Knabe
Supervisor Michael D. Antonovich

From: William T Fujioka
Chief Executive Officer

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "W. T. Fujioka", is written over the printed name of the Chief Executive Officer.

Board of Supervisors
GLORIA MOLINA
First District

MARK RIDLEY-THOMAS
Second District

ZEV YAROSLAVSKY
Third District

DON KNABE
Fourth District

MICHAEL D. ANTONOVICH
Fifth District

FUNDING OPTIONS FOR CLOSED CIRCUIT TELEVISION VIDEO DATA STORAGE (ITEM 63, AGENDA OF MAY 15, 2012)

On May 15, 2012, the Board requested that the Sheriff's Department (Department), Chief Executive Office (CEO), and County Counsel provide a joint report and recommendations within 30 days on video data storage, specifically, the length of storage, quality of data, and any associated costs and funding options, if necessary.

In Fiscal Years (FY) 2010-11 and 2011-12 approximately \$7.7 million in funding was provided to the Department to install Closed Circuit Television (CCTV) at the Men's Central Jail and Twin Towers Correctional Facility; of which approximately \$2 million has been set aside to upgrade the Department's video data storage system.

On June 14, 2012, the Department, with CEO and County Counsel's concurrence, submitted the attached report back that contained two video data storage options for the Board of Supervisors' consideration: OPTION 1 - 25 months of video data storage at five frames per second (FPS) and OPTION 2 - 25 months of video data storage at ten FPS. No additional funding is needed to implement OPTION 1. However, if OPTION 2 is selected an additional \$2 million in one-time funding is required. Potential funding sources have been identified as follows.

"To Enrich Lives Through Effective And Caring Service"

***Please Conserve Paper – This Document and Copies are Two-Sided
Intra-County Correspondence Sent Electronically Only***

FUNDING SOURCES:

1. Additional Net County Cost

Year-end closing for FY 2011-12 will be completed on August 24, 2012, at which time the CEO can determine if sufficient Department year-end savings and/or Countywide fund balance is available to implement OPTION 2. A final recommendation regarding this option will be presented to the Board during the Supplemental Changes budget phase.

2. Provisional Financing Uses Account

Currently, \$2.6 million in ongoing funding resides in Provisional Financing Uses (PFU) for the Department's Countywide Electronic Monitoring Program (EMP). The Department is currently preparing a Request for Proposal for EMP services and at this time does not anticipate the use of these funds in FY 2012-13. The Department indicates all costs associated with providing EMP services for the County's general population will be absorbed within their existing budget and AB109 funding will be utilized for the non-violent, non-serious, and non-sexual (N3) offenders.

3. Other Charges Cost Savings

The Department is anticipating an approximate five percent or \$3.5 million in year-end savings in their Other Charges budget primarily due to a decline in capital lease costs. However, typically any savings realized in this appropriation category is used by the Department to address cost overages in employee benefits and/or one-time facilities maintenance needs within the Department. In addition, there are multiple significant lawsuits pending as a result of the recently filed claims of jail violence which the Department may be found either partially or wholly liable. If this funding source is recommended, the Department may have to identify curtailments in other areas in order to fund the aforementioned operational costs.

4. Inmate Welfare Fund

Pursuant to Section 4025 of the California Penal Code, the Inmate Welfare Fund (IWF) provides for the benefit, education, and welfare of inmates confined within County jails. IWF receives revenue from several sources, including all sales of inmate hobby craft, vending machines, telephone commissions, and interest on deposited funds. In FY 2010-11, the Department expended \$31.4 million from IWF and estimates \$43.9 million in revenue for FY 2012-13. Using FY 2010-11

Each Supervisor
July 20, 2012
Page 3

expenditures as a basis, potentially \$12.5 million may be available for use by the Department in FY 2012-13.

It should be noted, however, that the IVF balance is generally carried over to address expenses in the upcoming year. In addition, the Department often uses this fund to offset any foreseeable or unforeseeable inmate or jail-related expense that cannot be absorbed within the Department's operating budget.

Chief Executive Office Recommendation

Of the above identified funding sources, items 1 and 2 are recommended for consideration.

Should you have any questions or require additional information, please contact me or your staff may contact Jocelyn Ventilacion at (213) 893-9740.

WTF:GM:SW
JV:cc

Attachment

c: Sheriff
Executive Office, Board of Supervisors
County Counsel

SHF.CCTV Funding Sources.Item 63.Agenda 051512.072012.docx



LEROY D. BACA, SHERIFF

County of Los Angeles
Sheriff's Department Headquarters
4700 Ramona Boulevard
Monterey Park, California 91754-2169



June 14, 2012

The Honorable Board of Supervisors
County of Los Angeles
383 Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration
Los Angeles, California 90012

Dear Supervisors:

**REPORT BACK REGARDING JOINT RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE
SHERIFF, CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICE, AND COUNTY COUNSEL REGARDING THE
QUALITY AND LENGTH OF STORED VIDEO FOOTAGE AND ASSOCIATED COSTS**

On May 15, 2012, your Board requested that the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department (Department) provide "a joint report and recommendations in 30 days on the video data storage, specifically, the length of storage, quality of data, and any associated costs and funding options, if necessary."

SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT RESPONSE

Consistent with recommendations by County Counsel, the Office of Independent Review (OIR), and Merrick Bobb, the Department is currently storing video recordings for a period of 25 months. The recommendations were based on State statutes [California Government Code Sections 34090.6(a), 34090.7 and 26202.6(a), etc.] mandating a video storage period of 12 months, and Federal statutes allowing person(s) to file a Federal lawsuit for up to 24 months. In order to comply with recommendations regarding video storage and remain within its existing budget, the Sheriff's Department is currently recording and storing video at five frames per second (FPS).

The Department's Technical Services Division (TSD) conducted a demonstration to show the difference between video footage at five FPS and ten FPS. While the video recorded at ten FPS was better, the reduction in quality was minor and only recognized during incidents with extremely fast motion. In most instances, the use of video at five FPS would be acceptable. The slower frame speed could be a factor if technicians were required to break down an incident frame by frame.

A Tradition of Service

The decision regarding video quality is financial. If funding were not an issue, the Department, CEO, and County Counsel would obviously prefer to have all video recorded and stored at ten FPS. Recognizing the economic circumstance of Los Angeles County, we have jointly developed two options for your consideration:

OPTION 1:

Storage: 25 months storage at 5 FPS and 720p

Cost: \$2 million (existing funds—no additional funds required)

Pros: Cost efficient
Long-term storage of video
Excellent resolution to identify persons involved

Cons: Could prevent frame by frame analysis during extremely fast motions

OPTION 2:

Storage: 25 months at 10 FPS and 720p

Cost: \$4 million total (\$2 million existing + \$2 million additional funding)

Pros: Excellent video quality

Excellent resolution to identify persons involved

Long-term storage of video

Cons: Additional funding required (approximately \$2 million)

Another option initially considered by the Department was storage of video for 14 months at ten FPS (Option 3). This option was based on the Board of Supervisors' policy adopted on June 29, 1999, which authorized the Department to discard all video after a 14-month period. It was deemed not viable because it failed to meet the 25-month criteria recommended by County Counsel, OIR, and Merrick Bobb.

OPTION 3:

Storage: 14 months at 10 FPS

Cost: \$2 million (existing funds—no additional funds required)

Pros: Cost efficient

Good quality video for long-term storage

Lesser burden on the Department's Data Network

Cons: Reduced amount of long-term storage

Should you have any questions or require additional information, please contact Commander James Hellmold at (213) 893-5003.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Leroy Baca", written in a cursive style.

LEROY D. BACA
SHERIFF